



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte. Von R. SMEND.
(Freiburg, 1893.)

WE ought soon to know our Bibles well ; at least, if we do not, it will hardly be from lack of qualified instruction. The stream of commentaries continues unchecked. On the *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch*, with its constant new editions "entirely revised," or "practically re-written," there followed the *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*, and quite recently a *Handkommentar* has been started, which, to judge from the two first instalments, will demand the more or less careful scrutiny of every student who wants to keep pace with the times. It is really very serious. And all this for the Old Testament alone! Then there come the introductions and the "theologies." In English we have one, and in Germany there are no less than three series of "libraries" or handbooks, which are to embrace the whole field of theological inquiry. So for the Old Testament introductions, in addition to Kuenen's monumental work, there are Driver, and Cornill, and recently König, and before long there will be Holzinger!

As for Old Testament theology, the book before us is first in the field. It consists of 536 large and pretty closely printed pages. It will be followed in England by Professor Davidson, in Germany by Stade in Cornill's series, which is happily planned on a smaller scale, and by Buhl in the more orthodox, and very lengthy series, which was started by the huge *Einleitung* of König.

Whatever may be the case with the three remaining books, Professor Smend's *Lehrbuch* is a very welcome addition to our store of Old Testament literature. Schultz's *Alttestamentliche Theologie* is a most useful work, and will not be rendered superfluous or out of date by its new rival. But Smend's book has special qualities and qualifications of its own. It is not an illuminative book, it is very long, not very original, occasionally somewhat indistinct, and the plan of it involves a certain amount of tiresome repetition, but it contains a great mass of valuable information. Moreover here, for the first time, we have an "Old Testament Theology" elaborately worked out on the lines of Kuenen, Stade and Wellhausen. Here, so far as religion and theology are concerned, is the plain outcome of their criticism. Here, for the first time, we have the historic periods rigidly separated, and the religion of each period—pre-prophetic, prophetic and legal—is delineated from the literary sources belonging to that period only.

Here we get, too, in the post-exilic period the marked distinction between the religion of the *Gemeinde* and the religion of the "indi-

vidual ;" and as we might expect from the author of the well-known monograph *Ueber das Ich der Psalmen*, the Psalter is used as the authoritative exponent of the former, while Proverbs, Job and Ecclesiastes furnish the material for the elucidation of the latter. (It might be well to note at once that on p. 476, n. 1, the post-exilic date of Proverbs is maintained and defended with some new and ingenious arguments ; cf. also pp. 490 and 514.) Professor Smend's book, moreover, is marked by sobriety and care : the references are constant and numerous, and thus the industrious student can check his author as he goes along ; little, except perhaps in Hosea (the usual place), is read into the parts which are most admired, while, on the whole, very fair justice is done to those other parts of the Old Testament with which our Professor (as a Protestant divine) is in comparatively little sympathy.

In the first division, which deals with the pre-prophetic religion and extends over 151 pages, there is little which need detain us. The conclusions of the three great critics (and as regards comparative religion those of Prof. R. Smith to boot) are closely followed. We get, for example, Wellhausen's high appreciation of Ahab (p. 155), the religious importance of the Northern kingdom (pp. 60, 264, 265), the Decalogue a product of the prophetic movement (pp. 47, n. 173, 278). Moses is depressed somewhat below the place which Stade has assigned to him, but he is still regarded as an historical person. I cannot say that I am converted as regards the date of the Decalogue, or as to its certain posteriority to Exodus xxxiv. 17-26. I am glad to find two eminent authorities on my side, namely Prof. Cheyne, in his "Founders of Old Testament Criticism," pp. 285-287, and Wildeboer in his very pleasant and valuable new book, *De letterkunde des ouden verbonds* (Groningen, 1893), pp. 24-26. Sometimes Professor Smend seems to me a little inclined to out-Herod Herod, as in § 7, *Jahve's Richten*. Sometimes he draws too wide an inference from a single verse, notably from Gen. xxx. 22 and xxi. 1 on p. 102. The best and newest thing in this section is the last paragraph, "Die Moral" (pp. 140-151).

The second division deals with the Prophets. It includes separate sections on Elijah, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Jeremiah, with some general remarks on prophecy as a whole (pp. 169-188). Ezekiel is characteristically included in the section on the origin of the Law. I do not think that Professor Smend has anything very fresh to tell us about the prophetic teaching, though the student will find many interesting and novel details sprinkled here and there (cf. pp. 214, n. 1, 222, n. 1). It is noteworthy that our author, unlike many earlier critics, does not admit that religious individualism was taught or

realised by Jeremiah (pp. 239-255). With Duhm he separates out the Servant passages from Isaiah xl.-lxvi. but assigns them to a writer who was about contemporary with Jeremiah (pp. 257-262). The fifty-third chapter, together with l. 4-9, refers to an individual, to one particular historic martyr (*i.e.*, to one who had already suffered a martyr's death when l. and lii. were written), whereas xlii. 1 *seq.*, and xlix. 1 *seq.* refer to the ideal Israel. But as for the phrase "he shall see his seed," that means only: "*Er lebt in geistigen Söhnen wieder auf.*" The last word on Isaiah liii. and the Servant passages has certainly not herewith been said.

Professor Smend is a believer in interpolations. He follows Wellhausen as to the last chapter of Amos (p. 183, n. 1), and has his doubts as to Hosea xi. 8b-12. In an elaborate note he accepts and defends the suggestion that Jeremiah xxx. and xxxi. (including, therefore, the famous "new covenant" passage) are post-exilic (p. 239, n. 1). His arguments here are very strong. As to the Prophets and their teaching generally, two points are worthy of note. The first is the emphasis laid on the view that it was the foreknowledge of imminent calamity which awakened in the Prophets the consciousness of national sin.

Als die Ursache des Verderbens kommt die Sünde dem Propheten erst zum Bewusstsein, wenn das Unheil naht und umgekehrt tritt der Gedanke an die Sünde zurück, sobald die Unheilsahnung weicht (p. 170).

Does not this ignore (with Wellhausen) the teaching office of the Prophets too obviously? Surely they could and did observe the sins of their age whether calamity was imminent or not. I wonder what Professor Cheyne will say to this theory of Smend's.

The second point is that our author expressly asserts that the essence of the prophetic function and message—the prediction of Israel's fall—is at bottom inexplicable.

Auf der Weissagung vom Untergange Israels beruht die weitere Religionsgeschichte des A. T. in ihrer Gesamtheit, aber sie ist auch gegen jede Erklärung spröde..... Veranlasst ist seine Weissagung (*i.e.* that of Amos) zweifellos durch das Nahen der Assyrier, aber sie ist daraus nicht zu erklären (pp. 161, 162).

And again, more emphatically still:—

"Die Weissagung des Amos war natürlich auch durch seinen Glauben an die göttliche Vergeltung und die damaligen Zustände Israels bedingt, aber erklärlich ist sie daraus so wenig wie aus der blossen Thatsache, dass Israel von Assur bedroht war. Auch die Combination dieser beiden Momente reicht dazu nicht aus. Vielmehr bewährte sich die Lebenswahrheit des geschichtlichen Jahveglaubens nun auch darin, dass der kommende Untergang Israels in den Herzen einzelner Männer seinen Schatten vorauswarf. Für die weitere Ge

schichte der alttestamentlichen Religion und der Religion überhaupt war diese Weissagung aber von einer solchen Bedeutung, dass sie uns als ein göttliches Geheimniss erscheinen muss (p. 164).

The most interesting and valuable portion of Professor Smend's book discusses *Die Religion des älteren Judenthums* (pp. 263-536). The plan of this section is as follows. We have, *first*, the foundation of the Law in two parts—(a.) Josiah and Deuteronomy; (b.) Ezekiel and the Priestly Code. *Secondly*, the faith of the Jewish community set forth—(a.) in its foundation by the Second Isaiah; and (b.) in its contents. (The contents are divided into six paragraphs: the main source is the Psalter.) *Thirdly*, Jewish individualism in three sections, called Job, Wisdom, and Koheleth respectively.

That Professor Smend's exposition of the post-exilic religion is entirely satisfactory cannot be said. Nobody's exposition can be that who is not equally at home in its Rabbinical as in the Christian developments, and equally ready to acknowledge the excellences and the limitations of both. The scholar who is learned in both directions, sympathetic and yet impartial, has probably still to be born. At present, even in Germany, he has shown no signs of his existence. Professor Smend, like many a predecessor, is still dominated, as it would seem, by the idea that the origin of Christianity implies a *bad* religion, to which it was opposed; that it implies not merely a revolt against a perversion of a good religion, but a revolt against a religion which was by its constitution and essence a bad one. Directly legalism became fully developed, religion, so Professor Smend seems to think, necessarily became purely formal, wholly unspiritual, without morality and without faith. If, as we shall see, *das ältere Judenthum*, i.e., pre-Maccabean Judaism, was not formal, not unspiritual, not lacking in morality and faith, it was so precisely because legalism was not fully developed. It seems never to enter Professor Smend's head, that the religion of Paul and the religion of the Rabbis might both be good religions, though neither of them perfect religions, or that love, faith and morality may be constitutive elements of a legal and a non-legal religion alike. I fancy the orthodox Jew finds it equally hard to believe in the excellence of the religion of Paul. It seems to me so simple and probable that each should be good in its way, both Paul's religion and the Rabbis'; but if this is so simple and so probable, why is it so generally disbelieved? I certainly am no mere apologist for the post-exilic or Rabbinic religion, though sometimes it might seem as if I were. For instance, with the righteous strictures passed by Professor Smend upon Jewish particularism and its consequences I am in full agreement (§§ 19 and 20). Of course to the partizans of the time impartiality was impossible.

Paul was bound to think his religion utterly good, true and spiritual, his opponents' religion false, bad and formal, and the Rabbis were bound to think similarly of their religion as compared with that of Paul's. But why must *we* think as the early Christians or as the Rabbinical Jews? Professor Smend appears to suppose that because God seemed *near* to a disciple of St. Paul, therefore he was necessarily *far* from the Rabbi. But why these oppositions? Surely as a matter of fact he was very near to both, although they approached him and conceived him in such different ways. Either religion led men and still leads them to God; either religion enabled and enables them to commune with him. God was and he seemed, God is and he seems, just as near to the good disciple of the Rabbi as to the good disciple of Jesus and of Paul.

Readers of Professor Smend's book will, however, notice a very marked difference in his treatment of the earlier post-exilic religion from what might have been expected from the author of the commentary on Ezekiel. To the Biblical products of the post-exilic period he is not only, on the whole, discriminating and just, but even sympathetic and appreciative. The way in which this is done, while a general attitude of condemnation towards legalism is, nevertheless maintained, is by making a wide cleavage between the earlier and the later Judaism, between the religion before the Maccabean revolt and the religion after it. It was becoming clear that a device of this kind was getting daily more needful and more probable. Now that for writers of the Wellhausen school, not only the Psalter, but Proverbs and Job, have all been relegated to the post-exilic era, it is obviously necessary to allow that such a period could not have been one of moral and religious destitution and sterility. But as the Jewish religion at the time of Jesus and Paul was *ex hypothesi* barren and formal, and so remained throughout the Rabbinical period, you can only maintain both positions by the device to which I have alluded. Hence we find Professor Smend in his preface urging that a much sharper difference must in future be made between pre-Maccabean and post-Maccabean Judaism. Because this has not hitherto been adequately done, pre-Maccabean Judaism has been considerably underestimated. That Judaism, he says—

entspricht durchaus nicht dem, was man gewöhnlich unter jüdischer Gesetzesreligion versteht. Die Psalmen beweisen, dass der prophetische Glaube, freilich in der von Deutero-Jesaja angebahnten Umbildung, im älteren Judenthum lebendig war. In allem Glück und Unglück, das ihm widerfuhr, erfuhr es die Gnade und Grösse, wie den Ernst seines Gottes. Schon damit war hier ein starkes Gegengewicht gegen das Gesetz gegeben. Sodann ist aber aus dem Buche Hiob, den Proverbien und noch aus Jesus Sirach evident, dass das Gesetz für das ältere Judenthum wesentlich die Moral bedeutete. Der gesetzliche Cultus und

die gesetzliche Observanz waren freilich von höchster Wichtigkeit für die Entstehung der nachexilischen Gemeinde und für ihre äussere Organisation in der Hierokratie. Aber der gesetzliche Cultus und die gesetzliche Observanz tendiren ihrem Ursprung nach auf die Moral und deshalb konnten sie im älteren Judenthum auch wieder zu äusseren Formen herabsinken, die der Moral nicht im Wege standen. Dagegen empfand das nachmakabäische Judenthum die Nothwendigkeit seiner Absonderung vom Hellenismus dahin, dass es sich im gesetzlichen Formalismus vergrub, und die Enttäuschung, in die die makabäische Bewegung auslief, machte der Zuversicht ein Ende, mit der die ältere jüdische Gemeinde in ihren geschichtlichen Erlebnissen die Wahrheit ihrer Religion anzuschauen vermochte. Da erst ist die Gesetzesreligion der Pharisäer und Schriftgelehrten entstanden, zu der das Evangelium in Gegensatz trat (p. viii.).

I have quoted this long passage in full because it is so exceedingly important. Let me point out what it implies. In the older Judaism the faith of the Prophets was still alive ; therefore, in Rabbinic Judaism it is dead. In the older Judaism men realised the grace and greatness of God ; therefore, in Rabbinic Judaism the grace and greatness of God are not realised. In the older Judaism the most important part of the Law was ethical ; therefore, in Rabbinic Judaism the most important part of the Law is ceremonial. Three tremendous implications, and all of them, as I believe, unjustifiable and mistaken. It will, however, remain for professed Rabbinical scholars to show that whatever else may be the differences between the earlier and later Judaism, the differences alleged by Professor Smend, whereby all spiritual and ethical reality is emptied out of the second, and exclusively reserved for the first, are radically misleading and erroneous.

What I feel tolerably confident that impartial Rabbinic scholars will find is that, assuming Professor Smend's description of the older Jewish religion to be wholly accurate, the later Rabbinic religion represents in many points (I do not say in all) a considerable religious advance. I believe, for example, that in doctrines of sin and of repentance, in religious individualism, in the conception of communion with God, in the spiritual joy of observing the Law, in the purity of religious motive, in the warmth and enthusiasm of its ethics, and (obviously) in the doctrine of a future life, Rabbinic religion represents a distinct advance upon the religion of the post-exilic portions of the Old Testament. I wish that three such adequately equipped scholars as Bickell, Wünsche and Schechter—a Catholic, a Protestant and a Jew—would each write a monograph upon this very subject. I quite admit that it is equally unsatisfactory, when I defend, or when Professor Smend attacks, the religion of the Rabbis ; it is those who know the literature, the *Fachmänner*, the scholars in Rabbinism, with whom alone the ultimate decision must lie.

Meanwhile, it is time to return to Professor Smend's book, which is, of course, concerned exclusively with that older Judaism upon whose faults and excellences he is so tried and qualified a judge.

An excellent estimate of Deuteronomy opens the chapters on the Law (cf. especially pp. 287-289). Ezekiel, too, is adequately presented. The view of him taken in the admirable Commentary of 1880 is now considerably modified (cf. especially pp. 313-319 as contrasted with *Commentary*, p. 308). There is much to be learnt from the analysis of the Priestly Code. The various causes and origins, if one may say so, of the ceremonial and ritual laws are capitally summed up on p. 327, and it is well shown how the whole body of them was taken up in the service of monotheism. It is also clearly explained how the laws of clean and unclean were connected with morality (pp. 328, 329). So, too, as regards circumcision (p. 330), and liturgical purity (p. 337). Altogether the sections from pp. 325 to 338 are most valuable and suggestive.

In no other German book, so far as I am aware, is the Psalter so fully *exploited* for a description of post-exilic religion. Take Smend's book and Cheyne's book together, and from one particular point of view there is not much more to be said. I referred before to the excellence of §§19 and 20. Students must often be puzzled to know when the "enemies" and the "wicked men" of the Psalmists refer to heathen oppressors and when to Jews. If they take the trouble to look up Professor Smend's references in these paragraphs, they will see the distinction clearly worked out. From § 19 on *Gottes Sieg über die Welt*, I will quote the following excellent passage on the relation of the Jews to the outer world, and its effect upon their own relation to God.

Mit aller Welt je länger je bitterer verfeindet waren die Juden ausser Stande den Glauben an ihren Missionsberuf und an das zukünftige Heil aller Welt im Sinne von Jes. xlii. 1 ff. festzuhalten. Aber gleichwohl wusste sich die jüdische Gemeinde als den unentbehrlichen Herold der Herrlichkeit Gottes in der Welt, sie allein konnte den Sinn der Weltgeschichte den Heiden enthüllen. Sie that das aber viel weniger durch die Predigt der Wahrheit (Ps. li. 15), als durch ihren Gottesdienst, in dem sie sich zu Gott bekannte. Bis er seine Weltherrschaft zur offenkundigen Thatsache machte, thronte er über den Lobliedern Israels (Ps. xxii. 4). Die thaten seinen Namen den Heiden kund. Gern erinnerte man sich daran, dass die jüdische Diaspora in aller Welt sein Lob erklingen liess (Ps. xlviii. 11; lxxv. 6, 9). Die Juden waren freilich auch des Gedankens fähig, dass auch der Gottesdienst der Heiden dem einen Gott gelte und auch so sein Name gross sei unter den Heiden (Mal. i. 11, 14). Aber thatsächlich stand die Religion auf ihnen allein. Er durfte sie nicht untergehen lassen, damit sein Lob auf der Erde nicht verstumme, in der Todtenwelt konnte sie ihn nicht preisen (Ps. vi. 6; xxx. 10; lxxxviii. 11 f.; cxv. 16f.; cxviii. 17 f.) I as Lob Gottes hatte im Munde seiner Gemeinde aber nicht nur seine All-

macht, sondern sein ganzes Wesen zum Inhalt, wie es sich in der Geschichte Israels von jeher geoffenbart hatte. Das zu verkündigen betrachtete die Gemeinde als ihre geschichtliche Aufgabe, aber auch sie selbst genoss in ihrem Gottesdienst eine geistige Anschauung der Herrlichkeit Gottes und damit ihr höchstes Glück (Ps. lxiii. 3 f.) (p. 386).

And here are two other telling passages about the way in which the unfortunate particularism of the Jewish religion, the conviction that they, the Jews, were in the last resort righteous, justified, and favoured of heaven, reacted upon their consciousness of sin. The second passage, however, contains much debatable matter, and is one of the instances in which, as I believe, Professor Smend has imperfectly apprehended the actual course and tenour of religious development.

(a.) Also sind im Bewusstsein der jüdischen Gemeinde ihr Recht gegenüber dem Unrecht, das die Feinde ihr anthun, und ihre Gerechtigkeit in Gott aufs engste mit einander verbunden. Die Nothwendigkeit dieser Verknüpfung ergibt sich auch daraus, dass durch die Noth, die die Feinde der Gemeinde bereiten, stets auch ihre Gerechtigkeit vor Gott fraglich wird. Denn ihre Gerechtigkeit vor Gott bedeutet zunächst, dass sie anders ist als die Heiden und die Gottlosen, dies Vertrauen wird aber zu nichts, wenn sie ihren Feinden definitiv unterliegt. Pest und Hungersnoth konnten als unmittelbare Schickungen Gottes viel leichter als Strafen Gottes ertragen werden, schon deshalb, weil auch die Heiden und die Gottlosen darin betroffen wurden, übrigens waren sie auch vorübergehender Natur. Aber von den Heiden und den Gottlosen war die Gemeinde immerfort bedroht. Die Glaubensnoth der jüdischen Gemeinde war daher vor allem Feindesnoth, der Triumph der Heiden und der Gottlosen stellte die Macht des Einen Gottes in Frage, er nahm aber auch der Gemeinde ihr gutes Gewissen zu Gott. Deshalb giebt es nur wenige Psalmen, in denen die Heiden oder die Gottlosen nicht irgendwie vorkämen, während von anderen Nöthen der Gemeinde wenig die Rede ist. Im Kampfe mit der Welt sah die Gemeinde ihr gutes Gewissen beständig bedroht und in ihrer Rettung vor der Welt und in ihrem Siege über sie verlangte sie immerdar ihre Rechtfertigung zu erfahren. Sie stellte sich aber auch, so weit der Druck der äusseren Noth, die sie schuldig sprechen wollte, ihr das ermöglichte, auf ihr gutes Gewissen zu Gott und so lange sie das im Sinne von Jes. xl. ff. that und thun konnte, stellte sie sich damit auf das wahrste und unbesieglichste Gottvertrauen. Im anderen Falle lag hier aber auch die Quelle einer Herzenshärte, eines Hochmuths gegenüber der Welt und eines Trotzes gegen Gott, die durch keine Lehre der Geschichte zerbrochen werden konnten. Das Eine wie das Andere muss man zugestehen (p. 405).

(b.) Niemals kam die jüdische Gemeinde über dies Schwanken zwischen dem Bewusstsein der Schuld und dem der Rechtfertigung hinaus. Jedes schwere Unglück brachte über sie dieselbe Angst, immer wieder empfand sie dann mit gleicher Schwere den Druck der Schuld, die so oft schon vergeben zu sein schien. Erst die messianische Zeit sollte ihr mit der Vergebung der Schuld eine ewige Rechtfertigung bringen (Dan. ix. 24). Eben darin war auch der

¹ When, in the name of history, did the post-Maccabean Jews show any *Trotz* against God? It would be difficult to say.

Eifer begründet, mit dem sie nach der Gerechtigkeit trachtete. Alles Glück bewies ihr, dass sie nicht vergeblich arbeitete, und alles Unglück rüttelte sie auf, so dass sie nicht lässig werden konnte. Unter dem Druck dauernden Unglücks musste ihre Frömmigkeit zuletzt freilich zu einer rein knechtischen Unterwerfung unter das Gesetz herabsinken. Auch konnte das Bewusstsein, Strafe verdient zu haben, nicht Schritt halten mit dem, Strafe zu leiden. Die Vorstellungen von Satan und von der Macht der Sünde bedeuteten nicht nur die Furchtbarkeit der Sündengefahr, sie haben bei Juden und Christen auch dazu gedient, das Gefühl der Verantwortlichkeit zu schwächen und das Gewissen abzustumpfen, wie das schon bei Zacharia deutlich ist. Aber das ältere Judenthum wusste auch, was echte Busse war, und es erfuhr auch die Macht vergebender Gnade, durch die es sich im Jubel über die göttliche Hülfe zu freudiger Erfüllung der ihm gestellten Aufgabe erhob (Ps. li. 14) (p. 433).

I propose now to call attention to a few points where Professor Smend seems to me to show a doubtful accuracy.

To the Law, as such, God is far. Why? The Law assumes that man is capable of fulfilling it: this means that God is no longer near to man. *Denn dieser natürliche freie Wille und die Erfüllung des Gesetzes sind allzu verschieden von der Bekehrung vom ganzen Herzen, die die Propheten gefordert hatten.* Schafft euch ein neues Herz und einen neuen Geist! *heisst es höchst charakteristisch.* Ez. xviii. 31. Vgl. Deut. x. 16 (p. 349). But surely Ezekiel is precisely the prophet of repentance (xviii. 30). Nor can xviii. 31 be pressed against xi. 19 and xxxvi. 26. What free-will has to do with God's distance I cannot conceive. The Jews never believed that this free-will was independent of God's grace and help, as a glance at their liturgy will adequately prove.

Professor Smend makes an amazing statement on p. 198, n. 1:

Für das Judenthum ist der Gedanke der Liebe Jahves von untergeordneter Bedeutung, er hat in ihm eigentlich gar keinen Platz, noch viel weniger die Liebe Israels zu Jahve.

This wonderful assertion is repeated with variations on pp. 363 and 437. No doubt there ought to be no such thing as love in a legal religion; but, unfortunately for logic and Pauline partialities, there was a great deal. Has Professor Smend ever read a Talmudic prayer beginning "With abounding love hast thou loved us, O Lord our God; with great and exceeding pity hast thou pitied us?" I thought the passionate love of Israel to its God would hardly have been denied, and as to God's love for Israel, why, it was the cause of its election. "Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast chosen thy people Israel in love." The truer attack would be to say that in Judaism God's love for Israel is so profound and so devoted, that he has too little left for the world beyond; to deny that he loved Israel, and that Israel

loved him, is the hardest of daring paradoxes, as it is the most susceptible of overwhelming refutation.

Again, we are told that the older Judaism was a religion of hope.

Aber in diesem fortwährenden Ringen mit der äusseren Wirklichkeit der Dinge ist der jüdische Glaube nicht nur erstarkt und geläutert, die Schläge, die der Weltlauf gegen ihn führte, haben ihn schliesslich auch erschüttert und anderseits ist er unter ihnen zuletzt auch so hart und starr geworden, dass seine Seele in ihm erstarb. Der Widerspruch zwischen innerem Glauben und äusserem Erleben war endlos und unlösbar und diese Einsicht war es vor allem, was zuletzt zur vollsten Veräusserlichung der Religion führte. In Betracht kommt hierfür die grosse Enttäuschung, in die die makkabäische Erhebung für die Frömmigkeit auslief. Sie hat dem Pharisäismus den Weg gebahnt. Schliesslich machte die zweite Zerstörung Jerusalems der Existenz der jüdischen Centralgemeinde ein Ende und schnitt den Juden damit jede Möglichkeit ab, in ihren äusseren Erlebnissen die Wahrheit ihres Glaubens zu erfahren. Von da an blieb ihnen nichts übrig als die resignirte Erfüllung des göttlichen Willens in Gestalt des Gesetzes, das sie nun erst recht in seinen Zwang nahm. Die Hoffnung, ohne die sie freilich nicht leben konnten, gehörte allein einer ungewissen Zukunft an, deshalb musste diese Hoffnung aber auch verweltlicht werden und die Frömmigkeit zu einem blossen Mittel zum Zweck herabsinken (p. 452).

Where is the proof? I think Professor Smend will search for it in vain. Judaism never ceased to be a religion of hope, and later Judaism became and remained much more optimistic than Biblical Judaism, because the doctrine of immortality and resurrection secured to each believer his unfailing reward. But there lurks a truth in Professor Smend's assertion, only of an opposite kind to that which he desires to imply. He says that the destruction of the Temple cut off from the Jews every possibility of realising in the varying circumstances of their outward lot the truth of their religion. But all the more were they sustained and upheld by the inward conviction of its truth and its nobility. If their outward lot became hard and cruel, the more were they cheered and recompensed by inward and spiritual joy. More and more did they find their satisfaction in the loving fulfilment of the Law.

For that Law was not a burden. Professor Smend allows that the ceremonial injunctions of the Pentateuch were "*leicht erfüllbar*" (p. 332), and for older Judaism, he admits that piety provided the individual with *inneres Glück auch in der Gegenwart* (p. 490). He realised *die beseligende Kraft* of moral action; it was a pleasure for him to do good. But all this is no less, nay, rather, it is much more true, for the Rabbinic than for the Biblical period of the post-exilic religion.

Indeed I should like to ask, Did the later Judaism know nothing of communion with God? That there was a sense of such a com-

munion in the older Judaism is, according to Professor Smend, proved by the Psalter. But the religion of Rabbinism is emphatically a religion of prayer, and if the prayers of the Psalter (p. 351) differ from Christian prayers in this that they aim at *concrete Ziele* only (I suppose there have been Christian prayers, too, which aimed at *concrete Ziele*?), then I believe that many Rabbinic prayers may be justly—I crave the Professor's pardon—denominated Christian. It is precisely "Christian" prayers which open the petitioning section of the Amidah; it is mainly a Christian prayer which closes them.

An important feature of Professor Smend's work is that, while the Psalter is exclusively used for the religion of the community—the "I" of the Psalms is always a personification, even in Psalm lxxiii.—he, nevertheless, lays great stress upon *der jüdische Individualismus*, devoting to it the last 63 pages of his book. He seems to believe, and I should think most rightly to believe, that religious individualism is the final fruit of all religious development. At the same time I do not see why it should not be combined with a full devotion to, and realisation of, the religious life and purpose of the community. Now we all remember how Wellhausen, at the close of a most superb section of his superb sketch, has said, "The religious individualism of the Gospel is, and must remain for all time, the true salt of the earth." Hence, from the point of view which assumes that the essential excellences of the Gospel must necessarily be absent from the religion to which it is opposed, a true religious individualism is wanting in Rabbinical Judaism. This is apparently the conclusion reached deductively by Professor Smend. In paragraph 25, entitled *Das Buch Hiob*, he discusses, very interestingly, the origin and growth of religious individualism among the Jews. Of the post-exilic community he goes on to say:—

Immerfort gab es einen kleinen Kreis von Frommen, die ihr individuelles Geschick ganz und gar auf die Religion stellen wollten. Freilich war der jüdische Individualismus zumeist durchaus nicht von rein religiöser Art, dann blieb er weit hinter der Religion der Gemeinde zurück. Wo er das aber war, kam er auch über die Religion der Gemeinde hinaus. In den Herzen einzelner Auserwählter erreichte die alttestamentliche Religion ihre höchste Vollendung (p. 475 fin.).

One of these *Auserwählten* was the author of Job. The moral of that book is this:—

Ist auch das gerechte Richten Gottes in den äusseren Schicksalen der Menschen nicht zu erkennen, so soll man gleichwohl an dem Glauben festhalten, das er richte und gerecht richte. Nach der Art dieses Richtens darf man freilich nicht fragen. Vielleicht besteht es nur darin, dass Gott von der Frömmigkeit und Gottlosigkeit der Menschen Notiz nimmt, ohne dass er sie objectiv irgend etwas davon erfahren liesse. Das Gefühl der Gemeinschaft mit

Gott, das die Erfüllung des göttlichen Willens gewährt, das Zeugniß des heiligen Geistes, soll den Frommen genügen. Reiner ist das Wesen des Glaubens nie erfasst als hier (p. 503 fin.).

And obviously, if this be indeed the moral of Job, it represents the *realised* religion not of Jewish *Auserwählten* only, but of *Auserwählten* in every creed. The famous verses of the 73rd Psalm, "Whom have I in heaven but thee," etc., can in every age be only truly *felt* by a small minority of every creed. Wellhausen has owned, *dass man sich ehrlicher Weise schämen muss, die Worte des 73. Psalms nachzusprechen*. As regards this Psalm, I would also allow the accuracy of the following:—

Einzigartig steht dies Gebet im Psalter und überhaupt in der vorchristlichen Religionsgeschichte da, ihm zur Seite stellt sich nur das Buch Hiob, das für den Einzelnen dasselbe fordert, was dieser Psalm für die Gemeinde. In der That ist es das Herz des Einzelnen, dass der Gemeinde dies Bewusstsein der Gnade geben will. Aber eine empirische Gemeinde konnte es nicht fassen, nur die Einzelnen waren dazu im Stande und unter ihnen auch nur die Auserwählten (p. 453).

But I am by no means prepared to accept the statement which immediately follows as historically accurate. Nor, though it begins with a "therefore," can I perceive the logical cogency of the conclusion:—

Desshalb waren die Wege des Herzens und Gewissens für den Einzelnen zuletzt anders als für die jüdische Gemeinde, dieser Individualismus konnte im Judenthum seine Befriedigung nicht finden, im Christenthum, das ihn dauernd begründete, hat er sich von der jüdischen Gemeinde geschieden (p. 454).

Now, why could not a pure religious individualism find its satisfaction in Judaism as well as in Christianity? I believe that it both could and did, and the odd thing is that, though the words of the 73rd Psalm are "unparalleled" in the Psalter, they *can* be paralleled in the Rabbinical literature. I do not see why a desire for the spiritual triumph of the *Gemeinde* should not be combined with a true religious individualism. "Daran wird nicht gedacht," says Professor Smend of the 73rd Psalm,

dass die göttliche Herrlichkeit an der jüdischen Gemeinde offenbar werden, dass mit der Gemeinde das Recht über das Unrecht, die Frömmigkeit über die Gottlosigkeit triumphiren müsse (p. 453).

This is not strictly accurate even of the 73rd Psalm, but may it not also be asked whether the Christian who *ex hypothesi* possesses true religious individualism may not also pray for the spiritual triumph of the Church, for the victory of truth over falsehood, of goodness over vice, of religion over impiety? *L'un n'empêche pas l'autre*, and if so, *was dem Einen recht ist, ist dem Andern billig*.

On no other point would it be more interesting for an adequately informed scholar to show the progress of Jewish thought than on conscience and sin. Professor Smend lays down the doctrine that in the Old Testament, both for the religion of the *Gemeinde* and for the religion of the individual, the sense of sin and of a guilty conscience was on the whole aroused only by misfortune and calamity. And *vice versa*, happiness betokened for the subject as well as for the observer rectitude and innocence. For the faith of the *Gemeinde* this doctrine is set forth most emphatically on p. 428, in the very interesting section entitled *Die Sünde der Gemeinde und ihre Vergebung*, as also on p. 433, in a passage already quoted. To the individual the same limitation is ascribed, because it is said of the book of Job that—

Hier ist zuerst von einer Selbstbeurtheilung die Rede, die sich abgesehen von dem äusseren Schicksal und dem Urtheil der Gesinnungsgenossen lediglich auf das innere Bewusstsein stellt (p. 499.)

In a note our author also says : *In diesem Sinne ist der Begriff des Gewissens dem Alten Testament sonst fremd.*

Das Schuldgefühl wird im Allgemeinen nur durch die Anklage des Unglücks wachgerufen, umgekehrt stellt Gott im Menschen das Gefühl der Unschuld wieder her durch die Rettung (p. 500).

It might be worth while to examine how far a certain amount of injustice is done even to the Old Testament by these limitations : if, however, they are true, then we have here another excellent example how Judaism, even on the Rabbinic side of its development, advanced beyond, and improved upon the teachings of the Bible.

Why, indeed, should it not have done so ? It is true that Professor Smend, thinks that *Die Moral war nicht mehr Moral, sofern sie Gegenstand der specifisch religiösen Satzung war* (p. 330). But though this may be true according to the deductions of a particular theory, it is not true in history or fact. Of the Prophets Professor Smend says : *hoch ragen sie über das spätere Judenthum empor, in ihnen bewegt sich die alttestamentliche Religion thatsächlich auf das Christenthum hin* (p. 9). This can only be accepted with many a limitation. If the later Judaism, with its pure conception and worship of the one God, with its thorough and simple morality, with its just civil and criminal code, and with its loving care for the poor and the afflicted, could have been presented before their eyes, they would have acknowledged that the greater part of their mission had been accomplished. The later Judaism fell below them in its particularism and in its "ceremonialism" (to use a single word for the imperfections and weaknesses of the legal system) ; but, on the other hand, in several other respects, for example, in religious individualism, in the joy of "personal religion," in the conception of a future life, with all its retrospective

implications upon man's estimate of his life on earth, in all these things *hoch ragt das spätere Judenthum über die Propheten empor*.

I have pointed out certain inaccuracies and insufficiencies in Professor Smend's book. But I have not, I hope, given any reader the impression that it does not also contain many merits and excellencies as well as an immense amount of useful information. The constantly increasing pile of books upon the Old Testament is very alarming, but, nevertheless, I much fear that every serious student of Biblical religion will have to read through the 536 pages of the new *Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte*!

June 23rd, 1893.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

Das Bundesbuch, Ex. xx. 22-xxiii. 33; seine ursprüngliche Gestalt, sein Verhältniss zu den es umgebenden Quellschriften und seine Stellung in der alt-testamentlichen Gesetzgebung. Von BRUNO BAENTSCH. (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1892.)

Das Heiligkeits-Gesetz, Lev. xvii.-xxvi. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung. Von BRUNO BAENTSCH. (Erfurt: Hugo Güther, 1893.)

THE author's aim in these two books is "to test, corroborate, and confirm in detail positions already won" rather than to establish fresh ones, the main positions on which the future treatment of the history of Israel must rest being already secured (*Bundesbuch*, p. 123; *Heiligkeits-Gesetz*, p. 153). He starts with the assumption that the Pentateuch is composite, and that the critical analysis is in the main correct; and, while his own investigations confirm it afresh, he is convinced beforehand of the accuracy of the Grafian hypothesis as to the date of the Priests' Code. It is, therefore, to those who admit the validity of his assumptions that his books will primarily appeal; but to such they can scarcely fail to be suggestive.

Each book, after some brief introductory matter, starts with a detailed analysis of the chapters in question, on the basis of which the author determines (a) the date of the constituent literary elements relatively to one another, and to other legislative portions of the Pentateuch; and (b) the actual date of each. The second book contains, in addition, a chapter dealing with the theological, ethical, and ritual ideas of the "Law of Holiness," with a view to confirming the critical results previously obtained.

The analysis of Bb (Baentsch's symbol for Ex. xx. 22—xxiii. 33) leads to the following results:—Bb consists, in the main, of two